UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/696,625 | 10/28/2003 | Yasuhiro Oshima | ITECP004 | 5609 |
| 25920 7590 08/06/2008 MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP 710 LAKEWAY DRIVE SUITE 200 SUNNYVALE, CA 94085 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | ANDERSON, JOHN A | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3696 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/06/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 10/696,625 | OSHIMA ET AL. | | | |
| interview Guinnary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | JOHN A. ANDERSON | 3696 | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO | personnel): | | | | |
| (1) <u>JOHN A. ANDERSON</u> . | (3) | | | | |
| (2) <u>George Leavell</u> . | (4) | | | | |
| Date of Interview: 22 July 2008. | | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative] | | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>2,8,9.10,12,18,19 and 21</u> . | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Lee</u> , <u>O'Hagan and McConnell</u> . | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g |)⊠ was not reached. h)⊡ N | I/A. | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's representative has further described the claimed invention and pointed out key features that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior arts. The applicant's argument would be considered upon filing a formal response to the last office action. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | |
| | /John A Anderson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3696 Examiner's signature, if requi | red | | | |